



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,689	07/14/2003	Hiromichi Ito	500.42924X00	3747
86636 7590 10/14/2009 BRUNDIDGE & STANGER, P.C. 1700 DIAGONAL ROAD, SUITE 330 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
ISMAIL, SHAWKI SAIF				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2455				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/14/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/617,689

Applicant(s)

ITO, HIROMICHI

Examiner

SHAWKI S. ISMAIL

Art Unit

2455

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/02)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/15/09
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

RESPONSE TO AMEDMENT

1. This communication is responsive to amendments received on June 15, 2009.

Claims 2-5 have been amended and are pending further examination.

The New Grounds of Rejection

2. Applicant's amendment and arguments received on June 15, 2009 have been fully considered, however they are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Seppala et al**, (hereinafter referred to as Seppala) U.S. Patent No. **7,120,131** in view of **Kim** U.S. Patent Publication No. **2003/0193921**.

5. As to claims 2-3, Seppala teaches a third information processing apparatus provided on a network and performing rent-out of an address, said third information processing apparatus comprising:

an Internet Protocol (IP) address pool including rent-out IP addresses (assigned COA address associated with the mobile device in a visited network);

a receiver that receives an original IP address of a second information processing apparatus;

a storage that stores correspondence information having a correspondence relationship among an Original IP address of a first information processing apparatus, rent-out address, and said original IP address of a said second information processing apparatus(col. 6, lines 12-23, COA list); and

wherein said second information processing apparatus is a partner information processing apparatus with which said first information processing apparatus performs communication using said rent-out global IP address (col. 6, lines 34-46, communication between the mobile node and other nodes is accomplished through the COA).

Seppala does not explicitly teach wherein said first information processing apparatus sends communication packets to said second information processing apparatus, said communication packets including said rent-out IP address as a source address, and said IP address of said second information processing apparatus as a destination address.

However, Kim teaches wherein the global or rent-out-address is used as the source address and wherein IP address of the second information apparatus is used as the destination address (refer to Figs. 5-7 and paragraphs [0034-0041]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of Kim into the system of Seppala in order to allow for IP address translation. This would allow a mobile node to communicate using a global or rent-out-address in a secure and seamless manner.

6. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Seppala et al**, (hereinafter referred to as Seppala) U.S. Patent No. **7,120,131** in view of **Saito** U.S. Patent No. **7,317,798**.

As to claim 4, Seppala teaches the claimed invention as described above, Seppala does not explicitly teach wherein, in response to an inquiry from said second information processing apparatus, said third information processing apparatus notifies said second information processing apparatus, with encrypted communication, of said inherent address of said first information processing apparatus

Saito teaches a communication processing system, a communication processing method, a server, and a computer program, which allow a secure communication between communication terminals. Saito teaches the aforementioned secure communication between a calling party and a server when a calling party wishes to identify a called party's address and location data to place a call to the called party. The server generates address data of the called party, encrypts the address data using a private key established previously and transmits the encrypted address data to the calling terminal (col. 6, lines 29-44 and col. 14, lines 37-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of Saito into the invention of Seppala in order to enable a recipient of an email which was sent utilizing the alias email address to find out the true email address of the sender in a secure manner. The server would disclose the true email of the sender to trustworthy recipients to enable them to communicate with the sender directly, This type of secure communication would safeguard the sender from having to disclose his/her email address

in an email in plaintext and have it become susceptible to interception from would be spammers (refer to Saito, col. 4, lines 42-54).

7. As to claim 5, Seppala teaches the claimed invention as described above, Seppala does not explicitly teach wherein permission to issue said notification is given in a case of a case that said correspondence information has correspondence information of said address of said second information processing apparatus and said original address of said first information processing apparatus, and no permission is given to said notification in a case that said correspondence information does not have a correspondence information of said IP address of said information processing apparatus and said original IP address of said first information processing apparatus (refer to Saito col. 6, lines 29-44 and col. 14, lines 37-48, the encrypted address data of the called party is made available to the calling party only when the calling party contains the correct public/private key combination issued to both the called and calling party by the server.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of Saito into the invention of Seppala in order to enable a recipient of an email which was sent utilizing the alias email address to find out the true email address of the sender in a secure manner. The server would disclose the true email of the sender to trustworthy recipients who contains the correct public/private key combination to enable them to communicate with the sender directly, This type of secure communication would safeguard the sender from having to disclose his/her email address in an email in plaintext and have it become susceptible to interception from would be spammers (refer to Saito, col. 4, lines 42-54).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, however they are deemed moot in new of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawki S Ismail whose telephone number is 571-272-3985. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached at 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Shawki S Ismail/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2455
October 13, 2009